

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 17 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claims 1-14, and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b). Claims 1-20 were provisionally rejected based on non-statutory obviousness type double patenting. Claims 15-16 were objected to. The drawings were objected to.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 15-16 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because the Office Action states that the drawings fail to show alphabetic components as described in the specification.

Applicant has responded by adding reference labels in FIG. 1 and FIG. 2. Applicant has attached hereto replacement drawing sheets for FIG. 1 and FIG. 2 with the added reference labels.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully requests the objection to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the Office Action states that the invention fails to comply with the enablement requirement.

Applicant has responded by amending claims 1 and 17.

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because the Office Action states that the invention fails to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant has responded by amending claim 20 and the specification.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the Office Action states that the invention is directed to non-statutory subjected matter.

Applicant has responded by amending claim 20 and the specification.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-20 were rejected as an obviousness-type double patent over claims 1-20 of commonly owned Application Serial Number 10/698141 and claims 1-20 of commonly owned Application Serial Number 10/698328.

Applicants have elected to provide a terminal disclaimer.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b)

Claims 1-14, and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent Application Number 2005/0033684 issued to Benedyk et al. on February 10, 2005.

Applicant has avoided this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

Applicant's claim 1, as amended, now recites,

"an intermediate application server component that provides one or more services to one or more telephony devices on a call through employment of one or more data streams associated with the call;

one or more user-related application server components coupled to the intermediate application server component to establish the one or more data streams; and

a conference bridge component coupled to the intermediate application server component."

Benedyk does not teach this limitation. This is because Benedyk does not disclose a conference bridge component. Thus, Benedyk is missing the "conference bridge component coupled to the intermediate application server component" elements, as recited in applicant's claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Benedyk. Since claims 2-16 depend from allowable claim 1, these claims are also allowable over Benedyk.

Independent claims 17 and 20 each have a limitation similar to that of independent claim 1, which was shown is not taught by Benedyk. For example, claims 17 and 20 recite “wherein at least one of the one or more portions of the intermediate network is an intermediate application server component coupled to a conference bridge component”. Benedyk does not teach this limitation for the above-mentioned reasons. Therefore, claims 17 and 20 are likewise allowable over Benedyk. Since claims 18-19 depend from claim 17, these dependent claims are also allowable over Benedyk.

Claim Amendments

Claims 4-9 and 12-16 were amended to add the term “and”. Claims 18-19 were amended to add the term “further”. Claims 1-16 were amended to change the term “apparatus” to the term “network”. No new matter has been added.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Carmen B. Patti
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 26,784

Dated: May 16, 2008

PATTI, HEWITT & AREZINA, LLC
Customer Number 47382